

<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

A Historical Theory of Organization and Management of
pöEurope s Orthodox East : A Weberian Re-enchan
Disenchanted Rationalization

Ahonen, Pertti

2012-05

pöAhonen , P 2012 , ' A Historical Theory of Organization and Managemen
Orthodox East : A Weberian Re-enchanting of Disenchanted Rationalization ' , Management
& Organizational History , vol. 7 , no. 2 , pp. 95-111 . <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744935912437462>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/232561>

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1744935912437462>

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

A historical theory of organization and management in Europe's Orthodox East: A Weberian re-enchantment of disenchanted rationalization¹

Pertti Ahonen University of Helsinki, Finland

Abstract

First and foremost I aim to contribute with a re-enchanting historical alternative to the winning Western model of disenchanted rationalization in organization and management. I also intend to offer moderation to the dominance of organization and management theories from Northern America and core Europe. I spell out a Weberian ideal type theory of Eastern Orthodox monastic organization and management. In doing this I implement Weber's advice to contextualize social and human science research on the principle of *Kulturbedeutung* —, cultural relevance. This I seek from present-day organization and management research, Weber's works, the self-understanding of Eastern Orthodox monasticism, and the geographical and historical predicament of my country. My argument advances from questions of aims and agency in Orthodox monasticism to its ethics, its aesthetics, its organization and management rules and hierarchies, and it's the aspect of its self-understanding made up by *aporiai* —, hard-to-resolve logical puzzles. In analogy with Weber's exploitation of his ideal types, in my conclusions I contrast my ideal type with organization and management theories of Catholic monasticism elaborated by Alfred Kieser and others, with two pronouncedly purified ideal types of Eastern Orthodox Christianity, and with a foremost present-day general organization and management theory.

Key words: Aesthetics • agency • aporia • asceticism • charisma • disenchantment • ideal type •

Kieser, Alfred • monasticism • mysticism • re-enchantment • Weber, Max

Towards elaborating a Weberian ideal type theory

Organization and management research proper evolved only in 20th century Western academia (Starbuck 2005), but this does not prevent us from seeking supplementation, integration of new elements or reorientation in historical conceptions of organization and management (Kieser 1994; Üsdiken and Kieser 2004; Booth and Rowlinson 2006). Meyer and Boxenbaum (2010, 749) see one obstacle to this in organization and management researchers' lacking insight into traditions of such regions as Eastern Europe, South America and Africa. Others have elaborated organization and management theories of Catholic monasticism (Kieser 1987; McGrath 2002; McGrath 2005; Inauen et al. 2010; Rost et al. 2010), whereas I will spell out a management and organization theory of the monasticism of the Eastern Orthodox Church.

Max Weber persists as Europe's best recognized classic of organization and management research (Meyer and Boxenbaum 2010, 746). Weber's (1985a, 191) methodology of theory formation entails the construction of ideal types with reliance on the rhetorical procedure of '*einseitige Steigerung... einiger* Gesichtspunkte... zu einem... einheitlichen Gedankenbilde' —, 'one-sided *accentuation... of certain* points of view... towards a... unitary construct of thought' (on grounds I will explain below, this is my translation).

Despite common references to Weber, ideal types in his proper sense have been relatively rarely articulated by later scholars. Weber (1985a, 170, cf. 1985b, 266–290) further characterizes his

methodology: *‘Es gibt keine... ‘objektive’... Analyse... der ‘sozialen Erscheinungen’ unabhängig von... ‘einseitigen’ Gesichtspunkten, nach denen sie... analysiert... werden’* —, *‘There is no... ‘objective’... analysis... of the ‘social phenomena’ independently of... ‘one-sided’ points of view, according to which they... are... analyzed’* (my translation). To elaborate an ideal type theory of Eastern Orthodox monastic organization and management, I synthesize elements from four complementary sources and structure my article on Weber’s (1985a, 181) principle of *Kulturbedeutung* —, cultural relevance. This he sees to determine what any piece of research may contribute in the first place. First, I look for cultural relevance by accentuating selected themes of present-day organization and management research (Clegg et al. 2006; Greenwood et al. 2008; Barry and Hansen 2008), both established (aims, rules, and hierarchy), and establishing itself (agency, ethics, and aesthetics). Second, Weber (1985c, 144, 724–725) and others (Meyendorff 1983; Lossky 1987) connect to the Eastern Orthodox Church and its monasticism particular characteristics of cultural relevance, namely *aporiai* —, logical puzzles. Third, I engage in search for cultural relevance from classical social research while exploiting Weber. Fourth, I acknowledge Weber’s (1985a, 209–210) reminder of the challenges of social and human sciences in their value-ladenness that derives from their subject matter. In the last issue I follow previous scholars of monastic organization and management; while they have devised organization and management theories of the Catholic monasticism of their vicinity (Kieser 1987; McGrath 2002; McGrath 2005; Inauen et al 2010; Rost 2010), I analyze Eastern Orthodox monasticism pursued since the Middle Ages in my country, Finland, let alone in its neighboring Russia.

Besides Weber’s contributions to organization and management theory, his sociology of religion is highly relevant to my study (Weber 1985c, 44, 124–130). I trace one bridge between those two domains in Weber’s stress upon religious and secular virtuosity (Weber 1988b, 545; Weber 1988c,

557–558), and another one in his juxtaposition of asceticism of two types. The former one is *innerweltlich* or *kosmisch* —, this-worldly. One of its particular characteristics entails *industria* —, gainful work. The latter comprises mysticism that is *ausserweltlich* or *akosmisch* —, other-worldly. This-worldly asceticism Weber discerns in the Protestant ethic and in much of Catholic monasticism, whereas he evinces the foremost Christian expressions of the other-worldly mysticism in Eastern Orthodoxy (Weber 1985c, 333–334; Mitzman 1969, 192–230; Robertson 1975; Adair-Toteff 2002). Weber (1985c, 329–336) methodologically demystifies asceticism, seeing it in any systematic exercise to pursue a calling of any type whatsoever. He likewise methodologically demystifies mysticism, deriving it from the common member's belief in the access of religious or secular virtuosi to spheres that are denied of the commons (Weber 1985c, 306, 330–331). Further, Weber (1985c, 142–148) denatures the Christian emanation of God's grace descending in the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:1–31) into his ideal type of charismatic authority, which is borne by religious or secular charismatic virtuosi whom their followership believes to possess extraordinary capabilities (Weber 1988d, 351–369; Conger 1993; Smith 1998).

Weber contributes with an ideal type that attributes the expansion of economic and legal rational authority to *Entzauberung* —, disenchantment. It dilutes traditional and charismatic authority, enclosing those concerned into what Weber metaphorically calls *stahlhartes Gehäuse* —, the iron cage. The latter translation is very solidly established in learned English despite lacking literalness. (Weber 1988a, 203; Chalcraft 1994; Baehr 2001.) However, Weber sees rationalization as ultimately unstable: it may be contingently interrupted by outbursts of re-enchanting political, religious or other charismatic authority (Weber 1985c, 122–148, 654–687, 1985d; Lee 2010).

Weber's conclusions on the contingent character of legal and economic rationalization led him to ethical considerations driven by his concern with impersonalized chilling of human relations in a world disenchanted by rationalization. One starting point (Sulek 2010) comprises classical Antiquity's stress upon *philanthropia* and *caritas* —, charity. Christian ethics steps in with the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25–37) with the core characteristic philosophers call supererogation —, good deeds that remarkably exceed what duty demands, incidentally susceptible in Protestantism to combat hypocrisy (Heyd 2006). Weber's (1985c, 333–334, 1988e, 466–467; Buss 2003, 1–18) interest in matters Russian further contributed to his ethical views, as evidenced by his appreciation of Tolstoy's and Dostoyevsky's pious literary characters (Weber 1988c, 55; Turner 1999). According to Symonds and Pudsey (2007, 79), 'what Weber (1985c, 355) regards as the most valuable ethics historically available' entails *wahllose Nächstenliebe* —, unselective philanthropy. Contesting egoistic empathizing only with one's own kin, Symonds and Pudsey (2007, 84) condense Weber's preferred ethics into the maxim that ideally, even the religionless 'modern heroic personality struggles to love regardless'.

The focus, methodology, and research procedure

Unlike its Catholic counterpart, Eastern Orthodox monasticism constitutes unity without monastic orders. We do not know the numbers of Orthodox monastics —, this term referring to both monks and female nuns. I estimate the present-day global number of Orthodox monasteries to rise to 2,000 at the maximum, recruiting from a base of 200 to 300 million Orthodox believers.

I wish to take up a certain more rarely accentuated aspect of Weber's methodology of the ideal types because of the relevance it promises for my study. Weber (1985b, 266–290; Palonen 2010,

95–124) regards the confinement of analysis to actual past events and the most likely future as downright bland. And indeed, he stretches his perspective to regard the entire set of *objektive Möglichkeiten* —, objective possibilities. He includes into them not only that which has actually been realized or will likely do so, but he takes up as well that which has not been despite that it might have, and that which remains unlikely but not impossible in view of the future. Weber stresses the analysis of ‘eine Tatsache fehlend’ —, attention to the possibility that something that actually did not take place might have done so anyway. Thus in terms of modern language Weber held a pronounced interest in the analysis of counterfactuals. (Weber 1985a, 203; Ringer 2000, 64–80, 2002; Weber 1985b, 266–290; Booth et al. 2009.)

Weber offers his theory formation of ideal types for several purposes including those that correspond with present-day exploitation of counterfactuals. My followership of Weber entails in this respect a certain contrasting that I will pursue towards the end of my study. There, I will emulate Weber’s procedure of sharpening ideal types by contrasting them with each other. In my turn I will contrast my necessarily one-sidedly accentuated ideal type theory of Eastern Orthodox monasticism with no less one-sidedly accentuated theories of Catholic monasticism elaborated by Alfred Kieser (1987) and others. I will also apply Weber’s (1985e, 436; Ringer 2002, 174) procedure of arranging ideal types into series, where the more and the less purified among them can be utilized for providing comparative theoretical reference points to each other. In particular, I will compare my ideal type theory with two more purified ideal type of the Orthodox Church and Orthodox Christian life.

The historical and cultural abundance of the topic that my theory elaboration shall have to cover leads me to pursue an analogy toward Geertz (1973) calls thick description, in order to accomplish

enough of what Van Maanen (1998, xiii–xiv) characterizes as ‘portraits of diversity in an increasingly homogenous world’. The 1,700 years since the first monasteries evolved, the differentiation of Eastern Orthodox monasticism and its discontinuities over long centuries deny serious organizational ethnography to speak of (Ybema et al. 2009). The same reasons also rule out archival research proper. Therefore I rely first and foremost on published sources also for my primary research materials. I delegate my 1998–2011 fieldwork in Orthodox parishes, dioceses and monasteries in Hagion Oros (Mt. Athos) and other locations in Greece, Russia and other countries occupies only to the invisible role of having provided for cross-checks to certain aspects of the documentary analysis. Despite hostility in parts of present-day organization and management research towards ‘copious footnotes referring to traceable sources’ as Rowlinson and Procter (1999, 377) put it, I shall refer to quite some primary, secondary and tertiary sources. Where I provide verbatim German citations for core passages of Max Weber’s texts, I carry out my own translations to moderate anachronisms and the heterogeneity of the available English interpretations (see, e.g., Baehr 2001, 154–157). I have compared all the translations of Weber’s key terms I give with the available translations in English and complied with the latter whenever possible. I have also consulted passages in the evolving complete edition of Weber’s works (1984). In my bibliographic entries on Weber I include also available English translations of his texts.

Eastern Orthodox aims and agency: Common to all, with monastic modifications

Acknowledging Max Weber’s emphasis on the importance of aims in characterizing types of action and organizations and institutions, I have to build into the ideal type theory I am elaborating aspects of the ultimate aims of Orthodox monastics and dedicated lay believers. That aim entails *kenosis* —, self-emptying. This should extinguish the earthly passions in the paradigm of Christ-

God's path from human incarnation to yielding to Father's requirement of redemptory self-sacrifice for His love towards humankind (Philippians 2:7; Hadot 1995, 138). Some self-characterizing metaphors of Orthodox monasticism are other-worldly, such as angelic life and paradise, whereas others are this-worldly, such as those on the monastic residents as a family with brothers and sisters and fathers and mothers (Gothóni 1993, 43–47). An Orthodox metaphor modifying Plato posits the monastics together with other believers as God's *eikonai* —, soul images. They shall strive to turn themselves into perfect partakers of the divine nature of God (Genesis 1:26-28; Matthew 5:48; 2 Peter 1:4; Plato 2007, 424; Alfeyev 2009, 48–50). Another metaphor (Weber 1988b, 538-539) characterizes the monastics and ardent common believers as mystical receptacles of God-emanated, uncreated divine energies in contradistinction to God's tools, the latter including the thrifty puritan Protestants and also the Catholics, mystics notwithstanding.

Orthodox theologians characterize the theology of the Catholic Church as cataphatic —, theology of logic, rationality and affirmation. On the contrary, Orthodox theology sees itself as apophatic, — theology of mysticism, direct lived experience and negation. In accordance with its apophatic character, Orthodox theology posits mystical virtuosi as the foremost theologians —, literally, knowers of God. They aim to reach unmediated union with God in likeness in God at *ekstasis* —, ecstasy, literally, a state out of themselves. (Lossky 1973; Meyendorff 1983, 10–14; Ivánka 1990; Alfeyev 2009, 166.)

The ideal type theory I am elaborating finds a further constituent in the Orthodox theological self-understanding of the generic methodological question of agency, which substantially intrigues also present-day organization and management theory (Meyer and Jepperson 2000; Reed 2005; Wang

2008). Unlike Weber's archetypal Lutheran and Reformed Protestants, who foreground divine energy they claim to emanate both from Father and Son, the Orthodox join the Catholics with a view called synergism —, literally, a doctrine of co-operation. Those who subscribe to synergism see energy to derive not only from divine sources; for the Orthodox, Father only, and for the Catholics, both Father and Son. They claim to find another, although minuscule but still absolutely necessary supplementary source of synergy in the free will of each believer. The latter, keenly pursuing the justification of their righteousness before God, thus stand out as nothing but God's *synergoi* —, co-workers. (Corinthians 3:9; Meyendorff 1959, 232–234.)

The encompassing Orthodox emotional ethics of monastic origins

The history of governance over souls and selves stretches over millennia (Rose 1990; Palmer et al. 1979–2007; Foucault 1988; Hadot 1995). In this respect Eastern Orthodox monasticism builds upon a tradition that is rarely studied in present-day academia. The Orthodox ethics is an emotional ethics that continues a tradition extending from Plato, with its focus upon the ascetic governance of passions to strengthen virtuous emotions and combat vicious emotions that cloud judgment and poison the mind (Meyendorff 1983, 67–72). The Orthodox ethics divides itself into three streaks, all of which derive from monasticism, where they continue to apply equally as in interiorized monasticism —, life of piety pursued by believers who continue to live in the secular world (Evdokimov 1998, 133–154).

The poet Pushkin (1985) and the scholars Billington (1970, 66) and Likachev (1999) point to St. Ephrem the Syrian's 4th century fasting prayer as the very paradigm for the first ethical streak, seeing it also as nothing but the synecdoche of the core Russian mindset. St. Ephrem enumerates

emotional vices which should be defied (procrastination, idle curiosity, lust of power, idle talk, and judgmentalism) and emotional virtues which should be nurtured (chastity, humility, patience, repentance, and *agape* —, divine love). The second ethical streak is one that Orthodox monasticism shares with its Catholic counterpart, comprising the virtues of poverty, chastity and obedience spelled out in the monastic vows. The paradigmatic Orthodox execution of the monastic virtues relies upon spiritual guidance offered to ordinary monks, novices and probationers by spiritually advanced non-clergy monks or nuns or by hieromonks —, priest-monks. Those under guidance are supposed to reveal even their most intimate deeds, thoughts and dreams in analogy with present-day psychotherapeutic practices (Gothóni 1993, 109–112). The third streak entails a developmental ethics towards the heights of mystical spiritual virtuosity through the steps of *metanoia*, *nepsis*, *diakrisis*, *apatheia*, *theosis* and *agape* —, repentance, spiritual alertness, discernment, dispassion, deification, and the seasoned mystic's embodiment of divine love (Palmer et al. 1979–2007, *passim*.; Runciman 1968, 128–158; Weber 1985c, 325, 328–333).

Orthodox emotional ethics has had its critics since the Byzantine nickname for its virtuosi, *omphaloskopoi* —, navel-gazers, no compliment even in our days (Runciman 1968, 141; Weber 1985c, 331). Rancour-Laferrière (1995) blames the Orthodox ethics for having generated a slave soul among Orthodox peoples, and Newman (2009) regards its application as nothing but programmed suicide. However, let us note that both in its first and third streaks the ethics entails also the aspect of *agape* —, divine love. It should be expended in the explicit purpose of preventing *anaesthesia* —, emotional and ethical numbing and coldness possibly combined with the hubris of spiritual pride.

Orthodox theology derives *agape* from the all-loving emotionality of *perichoresis* —, circumsincession. The general theological term refers to mutual embeddedness of the threesome of the Holy Trinity as communicated forward in the redemptory divino-human nature and acts of Christ. (Lossky 1973, 44–66; Meyendorff 1983, 159, 164.) *Agape* qualifies other-worldly Christian mysticism towards a social ethics of this-worldliness in the same sense as does Weber's (1985c, 355) *wahllose Nächstenliebe* —, unselective philanthropy. However, this is not suggest that charitable acts are limited to Orthodox Christianity only, nor, for that matter, any Christianity (Sulek 2010). Examples of charity offered in literature embrace, for example, unmotivated gift- and alms-giving, personal sacrifice, mercy shown towards others, human creativity to continue God's creation, and the substitution of the humble human stewardship of nature, people and organizations for arrogant ownership or domination (Genesis 22:1–19; Luke 10:33; Weber 1985c, 348–367, 1988b, 536–573; Meyendorff 1983, 151–152; Alfeyev 2009, 35, 49).

All-aesthetic Orthodox organization and management

I argue that the Eastern Orthodox Church stands out as a strong candidate for a paradigmatic all-aesthetic organization (cf. Gagliardi 2006). In its capacity as the extreme 'high church', it gears its comprehensively aesthetic character towards enhancing the monastics' and the other believers' convictions of their chances to attain communion with the divine spheres (Manoussakis 2007). The Orthodox Church intricately embodies the believers' experiences both sensually and emotionally, and accompanies this with simultaneously aesthetic, ethical and emotional enhancement of their religious identity (cf. Lakoff and Johnson 1999, 561–568; Gagliardi 2006, 713). According to Meyendorff (1983, 53), '(o)f all cultural families of Christianity... the Byzantine was the only one in which art became inseparable from theology'. Evaluating negatively the consequences to this, the

Czech historian and his country's founding president Tomáš Masaryk (1913, 445–449), criticizes the Orthodox Church for downright vulgar materialism in its tendencies to conflate with the spiritual aspect all that is valuable, whether true, ethical, emotionally moving or aesthetically appreciated (Bychkov and Bychkov 1998; McGuckin, 2008, 204–210).

The Orthodox conflationist tendencies include also the traditional construction of churches into theological three-dimensional iconic models of the universe, within which nests an iconic organization and management model of the Orthodox Church itself. The Church places itself under God's guidance, symbolized by the dome protruding towards the heavens, the nave where God's people pray under the dome, what the Church calls 'liturgy-in-colors' in the picture wall of the iconostasis between the nave and the altar, and the icons that proliferate in the church walls. The Church acknowledges Christ as its supreme leader with His icon traditionally painted high up inside the dome, and pursues a teleology oriented towards Christ's awaited second coming, which is symbolized by the eastern location of the altar, towards which the believers stay turned while praying in the divine services (Meyendorff 1983, 5; McGuckin 2008, 354–357).

Embodied Orthodox experience centers upon the Church in its capacity of an abstract spiritual institution. Orthodox theology mystically sees the Church to constitute both the combined body of the believers, the organismic allegory of Christ the sacrificial Lamb's mystical body, and the divine marriage of the bride made up of the believers to Christ the groom. Olfactory, visual and auditory elements and vigorous institutionalized kinesics and ritual kissing and embracing aim at further enhancement of the all-encompassing spiritual experience, together with the materiality of a relic inside each altar to signify Christ's grave. The materially embodied character of the Orthodox Church also constitutes numerous monasteries and churches into pilgrimage targets for the

veneration of relics and icons, many of which enjoy charismatic renown for miracle-working properties (Coniaris 1985, 27–45, 47–60; Coniaris 1987, 1–19; Ware 1997).

The Orthodox Church organizes its core activities around its seven divine mysteries in analogy with the seven Catholic sacraments. What it calls its ‘mystery of the mysteries’ in commemoration of Last Supper comprises the very principle that organizes the Church into a community in the first place, namely Eucharist —, literally, thanksgiving. To invite the Holy Spirit to descend onto the vehicles of grace made up of the holy gifts soon to deliver to the congregation, the priest evokes the spiritual climax of the Eucharistic liturgy, the prayer of epiclesis —, invocation. The Eucharist provides for believers’ participation in what Orthodox theology regards as the real presence of Christ’s body and blood in the bread and the wine being distributed (Coniaris 1985, 155–193; McGuckin 2008, 288–296). The related narrative of Orthodox organization and management history importantly diverges from the conventions of present-day history writing. Eliade (1959, 68–69, 88, 111–112) pinpoints the Orthodox liturgy as a set of practices through which believers ritually participate in the recurrent re-enactment of teleological, God-guided salvation history, which starts with the constitutive myth of Christ’s Incarnation, and eschatologically projects towards the ultimate perfection of the God-created world after Christ’s *parousia* —, the second coming.

A monastic particularity also with organization and management relevance entails the location of Orthodox monasteries in an actual or at least metaphorical desert set aside from the secular world to accentuate their other-worldliness. Monastics are bound to their way of life by their vows, which do not form a canonical part of the Orthodox divine mysteries yet without being seen as inferior to them (Alfeyev 2009, 156–158). Unlike in Catholic monasticism, where monks are amply

ordained, only a limited number of Orthodox monks receive the mystery of Holy Orders, transiting them into the monastic clergy that conducts the monastic divine services. As another monastic particularity, the monastics bear the metaphorical angelic habit tied with a girdle referring to St. John the Forerunner and their position as God's spiritual soldiers. The different varieties of the headgear they carry also entail symbolism with reference to their dedication to God. (Coniaris 1985, 47–60; Gothóni 1993, 56–67.)

Orthodox adaptability: flexible rules, flexible interpretations

The Orthodox Church shies away from such legalism as that instituted by the Catholic Code of Canon Law, nowadays of 1983. The Orthodox canons in the broadest sense include a multitude: the canonical and the selected deuterocanonical (apocryphical) books of the Bible, the holy mysteries crowned by the Eucharist, the patristics made up of the writings of the early Fathers of the Church, the dogmas summarized in the Nicene Creed, the canons in the constrained sense passed by seven ecumenical councils of 325–787 and by other authorities, the hymnography of prayers performed by singing or reciting, iconography, ecclesiastical architecture, and hagiographies —, studies of holy persons typically rendered in biographical form (Meyendorff 1983; Tchypin 2009). The normative heterogeneity allows for discretion for the bishop hierarchs to interpret the canons with principles that McGuckin (2008, 102–110) calls those of the hermeneutics of familial trust, ecclesiality, consonance, authority, and utility.

Besides the canons, regulation of Orthodox monasticism builds upon rules called *typika* —, model rules. The *typika* regulate the implementation of the divine services, the generic organization and management of monasteries, the organization and management of each individual monastery,

and the three issues together, which arises from the centrality of the divine services in monasteries and the derivation of the liturgical rules of the secular Orthodox world from monastic sources through drastic simplifications. The earliest generic monastic *typika* comprise the 4th century rules of St. Pachomios, also noted in Catholicism (Kieser 1987, 105–108), the Long Rules and Short Rules by Pachomios' contemporary St. Basil, and Constantinople's Studite monastery rules, which evolved from the 5th century onwards. With remarkable global uniformity, the three rule sets continue to constitute the basis of the rules of present-day Orthodox monasteries (Thomas and Hero 2000; Amand 1948).

Orthodox parishes, dioceses and monasteries have to pursue economic rationality to sustain themselves, but the truly important Orthodox economy is the one covered by the special notion *oikonomia* —, also literally, economy. It bears definite implications for flexible organization and management. According to the paradigmatic scriptural passage of Ephesians 1:9–10, God's grace set up the *oikonomia* of a teleological plan of salvation in Christ. Further, 1 Colossians indicates that the apostles and their hierocratic successors who occupy divine offices stand out as *oikonomoi* —, here, stewards. Their duties are to pursue ecclesiastical *oikonomia* —, now, stewardship. They also shall distribute the vehicles of grace derived from God's *oikonomia* —, here, the divine plan salvation. Moreover, *oikonomia* frequently refers to an economics of grace implemented with casuistic, lenient pastoral exceptions to canonical rules in order to enhance the flow of God's *oikonomia* — here again, the plan of salvation. Finally, *oikonomia* refers to the spiritual regulation of the passions taking place both inside and outside monasteries. (Meyendorff 1983, 88–90, 131–132; Runciman 1968, 5–6; McGuckin 2008, 182–276; Paganopoulos 2009).

Do not obstruct the flow of charisma: Strict hierarchies only at the other-worldly top

In Orthodox monastic organization and management ‘stories that privilege founders’ (Rowlinson and Procter 1999, 374) definitely abound. Equally as the Catholic Church, the Orthodox Church subscribes to St. Denys Areopagite’s doctrine on complex spheres and categories of heavenly hosts (cf. Parker 2009). The number goes up to thousands and even tens of thousands for Orthodox divine intercessors —, canonized persons and their groups to receive veneration. However, the purposes of my study call me to focus upon Orthodox this-worldly organization and management only.

Complex this-worldly Orthodox hierarchies prevail, but they remain pronouncedly incomplete. There is no monocratic Orthodox Church head comparable with Catholicism’s Bishop of Rome, the Pope. The Orthodox Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople does possess elevated prerogatives over the *oikoumene*—, the global Orthodox world. However, canonically he remains only the foremost among the canonically coequal bishop hierarchs. In its organization and management tradition, the Orthodox Church stands out as an episcopal church that emphasizes rule by bishops in their dioceses. With pronounced differences between different Orthodox Churches, the celibate bishops are recruited from amongst veterate hieromonks or co-opted prior to elevation into the episcopate into a monastic brotherhood from among bachelor or widower priests having worked in the secular world (Tchypin 2009, 333–344). Under the bishops lie the monasteries with their monks and nuns and also the parishes with their priests, who unlike their Catholic colleagues may marry insofar as they do so prior to Ordination. The Orthodox Churches of Constantinople and Moscow and twelve other nationally constituted churches enjoy the decided canonical

independence of autocephaly —, literally, having their own head. Dependence neither characterizes some of the Orthodox churches with the lesser canonical standing of autonomy —, literally, living under one's own laws. The situation may be different in canonically autonomous churches under the jurisdiction of strong autocephalous churches. Many but not all Orthodox autocephalies and autonomies stand out as established state churches or traditional or national churches of their host countries. (Runciman 1968, 320–337; Roudometof 2008; Madeley 2009).

Orthodox governance of relationships between politics and religion – the throne and the altar – derives its roots from Emperor Justinian's 529 declaration of the politico-theological norm *symphonia* —, literally, agreement. The Orthodox canons continue to include – legitimated with reference to the scriptural principle 'neither Jew nor Greek' but 'all one in Christ' (Galatians 3:28) – the 1872 Constantinople Synod condemnation of *ethnophyletism* —, religious ethnocentrism. (Runciman 1968, 73–74; Roudometof 2008.) However, ever since Byzantine and Russian religious exaltation of the autocratic secular ruler and the Russian strict state control of the Orthodox Church between 1721 and 1991, a certain thesis of Weber's (1985c, 691–692, 1988b, 546, 554) continues to receive support. He argued that serious contradictions are likely to arise between political governance on the one hand, and on the other the brotherhood and sisterhood of Eucharistic redemptory religion. Current cases of point include national Orthodox churches which have arisen since the end of Communism in Europe and striven for ecumenical Orthodox recognition but so far in vain, and conflicts between canonically recognized Orthodox churches with contradictory jurisdictional claims (Roudometof 2008).

Orthodox hierocracy of clergy power (Weber 1985d, 29–30) articulates its legitimation claims of apostolic succession by means of *cheirotonia* —, the laying of hands by established hierarchs upon

the head of the novice hierarch. This procedure shall shed what Weber (1985d, 144–146, 675, 692–698, 713–724) calls *Amtscharisma* —, charisma related to the occupation of an office. The monopoly to administer the Eucharistic vehicles of grace to the believers is indeed vested solely with the clergy made up of the bishop hierarchs, the parish priests and the hieromonks —, the monk-priests.

In view of their organization the first Orthodox monasteries conducted *idiorrhythmia* —, an order of independent life led by each monks or nun. Idiorrhythmia entails few common rules and possibly no common divine services despite monastic dwellings shared by the monks or nuns. From St. Pachomios' and St. Basil's 4th century monastic rules and the later Studite monastic rules derives another form of monastic organization, the *koenobia* or *cenobia* —, the community or 'cenobitic' form of monastic organization. It entails definite norms on the monastic life including rules that prescribe attendance in common and frequent divine services (Amand 1948).

Since late 15th till mid-16th century in Russia, wars raged between the supporters of alternative forms of monastic organization and management. Cenobitic monasteries capable of accumulating land and other property were the preference of those called *styazhateli* —, possessors. Their opponents comprised the *nestyazhateli* —, the non-possessors. The latter were made up of hesychasts —, quietists in a special Orthodox sense. The latter preferred a life in remote areas, living in *sketes* —, small idiorrhythmic monastic communities (Runciman 1968, 325-327; Zenkovsky 2003, 30–31). The cenobitic and the idiorrhythmic forms of monastic organization and management continue to coexist, with the exception of Orthodox churches such as that Russia that prescribes the cenobitic model only (Tchypin 2009, 357).

Management by the Orthodox hierarchy of priestly power stands out as comprehensive only outside the monasteries, regarding which a chain of command proceeds from patriarch to archbishop, bishop and the individual parish priests. Each common monastery falls under the jurisdiction of a diocesan bishop, whereas some monasteries are subordinate to a patriarch, then called stavropegic —, literally referring to the first placing of a cross on the coming monastic site. Within monasteries a triple institutionalized hierarchy can be discerned. A priestly hierarchy descends from the monastic head to other hieromonks —, monk-priests. Another hierarchy with a more secular character descends from the monastic head to those monks or nuns each of whom directs some definite monastic function, and ultimately to the other monastic residents. The third institutionalized hierarchy bears a spiritual character with its basic level made up of the ordinary monks or nuns who have taken the monastic vows, or, as this is also expressed, entered the small scheme —, the ordinary order of life of a monk or nun who has taken the vows. In monastic terminology they are also known as the stavrophors —, the cross-bearers. The lowest level comprises those solid monastic residents who have been co-opted into the monastic brotherhood or sisterhood without vows at least so far, the rasophors —, the cloak-bearers, also called half-monks. In principle, the highest level is made up of the monastics living according to the grand scheme —, the most demanding monastic order of life dedicated to little else than constant prayer. The three monastic hierarchies overlap in the traditional practices – not entirely abandoned at least so far – of electing the monastic head from among the monks or nuns themselves, and promoting the monastic clergy from amongst the male monastery's brotherhood. All three monastic hierarchies may be transcended where appear figures called the Greek language calls *geron* and Russian *starets* —, mystical charismatic virtuosi, spiritual leaders, also called elders (Weber 1988c, 557). The position of the elders vis-à-vis the three hierarchies remains contingent. Both bishops, actual monastic heads, grand-scheme monks or nuns with or without a

prior position as monastic head, parish priests, ordinary hieromonks and non-clergy small-scheme monks or small-scheme nuns are known to have turned elders. Although elder charisma may catalyze the splitting of new monasteries from pre-existing ones (Silber 1995, 42–43), most elders have in no way contested monastic institutional stability.

We receive help to interpret the intricacies of the Orthodox monastic hierarchies if we refer to aspects of charisma that I took up in the beginning part of my article. Orthodox monastic tradition does not appear to see the flow of charisma to be sufficiently ensured by the remarkably rationalist monastic hierarchy that descends from the monastic head to the other members of the monastic management and ultimately the other monastic residents. Despite its legitimating background in apostolic succession, neither the *Amtscharisma* vested in the monastic hierarchy of priestly offices may not generate strong enough charisma, nor may the instituted three-level spiritual hierarchy of the monks and nuns be able to guarantee the unfettered flow of charisma. On the contrary, the contingently appearing elders excellently correspond with Weber's (1988d, 351–369) characterization of charismatic authority that depends on the belief of a followership in the extraordinary capabilities of exemplary spiritual virtuosi. Orthodox churches also emphasize the first popular legitimation of a spiritual virtuoso before his or her posthumous canonization can be taken into consideration (Tchypin 2009, 594–610).

Orthodox management and organization by *aporiai* —, logical puzzles

Weber (1985c, 144, 724–725) and the Orthodox theologians Meyendorff (1983) and Lossky (1987) stress the importance of Orthodox Christian *aporiai* —, philosophical logical puzzles. These the authors derive ultimately from the characteristics of the creed's theology that stand out as

apophatic —, proceeding through negations and accentuating direct mystical experience.

Conceptually, an aporia entails conclusions that arise from two or more contrary sets of premises that first appear as equally valid. One Orthodox aporia builds upon the paradigms of St. John the Forerunner and St. Paul: ‘If anyone among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise’ (1 Corinthians 3:18). The passage helps render intelligible the appearance of the few *saloi* who have been canonized in Greece and the many *jurodivye* who have been so elevated in Russia —, both words meaning Fools in Christ, briefly, holy fools. They contest the solemnity of the priestly hierarchs, the rational hierarchy of monastic organization and management, the institutionalized spiritual hierarchy of the monks or nuns, and the authority of the more rigorist ones among the elders. The holy fools also despise spiritual vainglory, promise to expend the gift of prophecy, and pursue asceticism and mysticism in absurd extremes. (Billington 1970, 59–60; Fedotov 1966, 316–343.)

In professional organization and management history few compliments are given to texts bearing characteristics of hagiographies —, studies of holy persons aiming to accentuate their holiness ever further. Hagiographies definitely abound in the Orthodox Church, but from the professional organization and management history point of view it stands out as both relevant and interesting that the Orthodox hagiographic tradition includes the aporia of what I choose to call ‘counter-hagiographies’ in the absence of any established name for the phenomenon. These reveal how some of the apparently holy personalities have turned out to be grossly unworthy of any posthumous veneration whatsoever (e.g., Ward 2004).

Another remarkable Orthodox aporia regards the tedious relationships between the hierocracy of priestly power and all believers’ pneumatocracy —, the common rule of them all in Holy Spirit.

This pronounced brother- and sisterhood bears implications for nothing less than the canonical priesthood, spiritual royalty and the vocation of prophecy of each and every believer —, child, adult, woman, and man. (Runciman 1968, 50; 1 Peter 2:9; Liveris 2005, 158–159; Smith 1998, 43–46; Weber 1985c, 144, 724–725.)

Conclusions and further directions

Pinpointing the character of the accomplished ideal type theory

I have elaborated a theory of Eastern Orthodox monasticism as an ideal type in Max Weber's sense without any intentions whatsoever to make additions to or subtractions from Weber's views. I have also applied Weber's (1985a, 170) methodological procedure of rhetorical *einseitige Steigerung* —, one-sided accentuation. I have supplemented this procedure with adherence to Weber's (1985a, 181) important principle to look for *Kulturbedeutung* —, cultural relevance. I have been looking for it in four directions: established and still establishing organization and management research, the intricacies of my topic of investigation, relevant parts of Weber's work, and the value-laden historical and cultural predicament of my country.

Being an ideal type, my theory of Eastern Orthodox monastic organization and management entails a sample from amongst what Weber (1985b) calls *objektive Möglichkeiten* —, objective possibilities. Some of these have realized in the past or are likely to do so in the future, whereas the others have remained or are likely to remain what we nowadays call counterfactuals. The emphasis upon the contingency of actions and states of affairs to build into ideal type theories (Weber 1985c, 1985d) connects also to what Weber calls *adäquate Verursachung* —, adequate

causation. This he inserts into the very core of his view of scientific explanation in the social and human sciences (Weber 1985b, 283–287; Ringer 2002). Weber (1985b, 285) writes: ‘(Wir)... können... den *Grad* der Begünstigung eines... Erfolges... durch den *Vergleich* mit der Art, in welcher andere, abgeändert gedachte Bedingungen ihn ‘begünstigt’ haben ‘würden’... einschätzen... und... ein Urteil über den ‘Grad’ der objektiven Möglichkeit [bilden]’ —, ‘We... can... assess... the *degree* to which... a certain... occurrence... has been favored by certain conditions... by *comparison* with the way that other, counterfactual (*abgeändert gedachte*) conditions ‘would’ have ‘favored’ it..., and formulate a judgment of the ‘degree’ of the objective possibility [of the occurrence]’ (my translation).

The search for adequate causation brings into the focus Eastern Orthodoxy’s adoption of management and organization characteristics that have made their pronounced contributions to enabling the persistence of the creed’s monasticism over long and difficult centuries. Some of the favoring conditions that I could in principle take up fail to bear remarkable organization and management import or fail to pertain to Orthodox monasticism alone. These conditions include the monastics’ other-worldly aim to die to the world, their ascetic emotional ethics qualified with unselective philanthropy, and the Orthodox conflation of the true, the ethical, the emotionally touching and the aesthetically valuable with that which is spiritual. This leaves me with three key characteristics of Orthodox monasticism with organization and management bearing to analyze from the viewpoint of adequate causation. First, there are the two important sources of flexibility, namely the Orthodox absence of a counterpart to the Catholic Code of Canon Law, and the Orthodox *oikonomia* —, economy in its more than one particular Orthodox sense. The key role of *oikonomia* also comprises its facilitative role in the lenient interpretation of the readily flexible Orthodox canons. Second, Orthodox hierarchical organization structures stand out in their

multiplicity, their overlaps and their contingent transcendence by the charismatic figures of the elders. Third, there are the Orthodox *aporiai* —, the Orthodox logical puzzles. Those among them that bear organization and management relevance include the possibility that the paradoxical figures of holy fools appear and, no less paradoxically, that apparent elder figures turn out to deserve nothing but what I call counter-hagiographies, revealing them to be most unworthy of posthumous veneration.

I am aware of claims expounded both from within and without the Orthodox Church that the characteristics I have taken up above would be witness to weakness, hopeless underdevelopment of rational authority and an incurable conservatism that spawns courtship with questionable secular rulers (e.g., Benz 1963). However, from the organization and management research point of view those very characteristics entail remarkably adaptable institutionalization, which is evidenced by Orthodox monastic resilience for over 1,300–1,700 years and the capability of renewal and recovery after decades or even centuries of demise, the most recent case being the one in Eastern Europe since the 1980s. It is also important to foreground the counterfactual made up of the absence of Eastern Orthodox Papacy. This qualifies many of the characteristics that Orthodoxy shares within Catholicism, including both old churches' versions of Weber's best favored ethics of *wahllose Nächstenliebe* —, unselective philanthropy. While in Orthodoxy it may often be applied remarkably freely despite constraints set up by individual Orthodox churches, in Catholicism it remains subject to rationalizing and unifying centralized Papal overlordship.

Utilization of the ideal type theory for comparisons and further extensions

While elaborating the approach I apply, I committed myself to illustrating my necessarily one-sidedly accentuated ideal type theory of Eastern Orthodox monasticism by contrasting it with its no less one-sidedly accentuated counterparts regarding Catholic monasticism as elaborated by others. My analysis sufficiently resembles historical research to differ from remarkably straightforward projections – although some of them ingenious – of present-day organization and management theory for the analysis of historical monasticism in ways that the historian regards as anachronistic (McGrath 2002, 2005; Inauen et al. 2010; Rost 2010). My analysis remarkably more closely resembles Kieser's (1987) study, although there are also remarkable differences. Kieser (1987) elaborates the nowadays commonly accepted view of the role of Catholic monasticism as possibly the earliest example of the Western rational model of organization. I fully accept this view, but I also take an alternative course that Weber (1988a, 203) brings forward in his metaphorical characterization: 'Nur wie 'ein dünner Mantel...', sollte... die Sorge um die äusseren Güter um die Schultern [der] heiligen liegen[,...]... (a)ber aus dem Mantel liess das Verhängnis ein stahlhartes Gehäuse werden' —, 'Concern with the acquisition of external goods... was supposed... to lie on the shoulders of the blessed... only like 'a thin cloak'... , but fate let the cloak turn into [what very established scholarly parlance in English continues to call, my note] an iron cage' (my translation).

DiMaggio and Powell (1983) and Kieser (1987) are among those organization and management scholars who have elaborated upon those of the objective possibilities suggested by Weber's metaphor that pinpoint ever more complete rationalization. My ideal type, on the contrary, accentuates a set of possibilities that have remained and, as I see it, are likely to remain counterfactuals by and large. My ideal type theory takes up, in particular, how in Eastern Orthodoxy and its monasticism frequent shedding of Weber's 'iron cage' may take place –

although this is only to suggest discontinuity instead of any full arrest ever to the forward global march of Western rationalization. Incidents of shedding with organization and management relevance comprise the *oikonomia* of the lenient interpretation of the Orthodox canons and the incompleteness of the monastic and other Orthodox hierarchies. I argue that the most pronounced shedding comprises both in the Orthodox Church in general and its monasticism in particular the contingently appearing elder charismatics together with the holy fools, and also what I have called counter-hagiographies that reveal some of those first believed to belong to the very holiest to deserve no posthumous veneration at all. I argue that the ultimate engine for the occasional shedding of the iron cage comprises the Orthodox religious mysticism of monastic origins, fine-tuned by what was also Weber's (1985c, 385, 1985d, 612) preferred ethics of *wahllose Nächstenliebe* —, unselective philanthropy. In keeping with the uses of ideal types indicated by Weber, I see studies that emphasize the iron cage of rationalization and my ideal type theory that pinpoints the possibilities of its occasional shedding not as substitutes but as complements to exploited for sharpening each other whenever and wherever they can be constructively juxtaposed.

In elaborating the methodology to apply, I also committed myself to Weber's (1985e, 436; Ringer 2002, 174) procedure of arranging ideal types into series where the more purified ones and their laxer counterparts provide reference points for each other. I consider Evdokimov's (1998, 133–154) notion of interiorized monasticism pursued by advanced believers living in the secular world to comprise a building block for a more purified ideal type theory of Orthodox piety than the one I have articulated, even up to a certain relativization of the entire institution of monasticism. I derive elements for a still more purified ideal type theory from the Orthodox canonical principle of the spiritual brother- and sisterhood of all believers, bearing implications for nothing less than the

canonical priesthood, spiritual royalty and the vocation of prophecy of each and every believer. In its drastically one-sided accentuation, the pneumatocratic ideal type suggests transcendence of the hierocracy of priestly power, and it also puts into question all differentiations between those floating spiritual heights – higher clergy, monastics and advanced lay believers – and the hordes of ordinary sinners.

I also wish to remind of the limitations of the methodology of ideal types. As Weber (1985a, 191) puts it: 'In seiner Reinheit ist dieses Gedankenbild nirgends in der Wirklichkeit vorfindbar, es ist eine Utopie' —, 'In its purity this thought construct can be found nowhere in reality, it is an utopia' (my translation). Moderating the one-sided accentuations built into my ideal type theory allows us to acknowledge that in actual practice many Orthodox peoples apply a work ethic that may much resemble its Catholic, Lutheran or other Western counterparts (Rosenthal 1991) with little religious mysticism qualified with unselective philanthropy. The moderation also lets in historical evidence of large and wealthy Eastern Orthodox monasteries as opposed to the ideal typical other-worldly mystical monks and nuns leading a vegetative existence. Last, the moderation de-emphasizes differences between Orthodox and Catholic monasticism given that the latter has definitely not shied away with all religious mysticism nor abandoned the veneration of holy fool-like figures such as the prominent St. Francis of Assisi (Kieser 1987, 119).

I finish with an exemplary illustrative comparison of my ideal typical theory with a selected streak of present-day organization and management theory and research. From among the many possible alternative comparators, I pick up what its foremost representatives call phenomenological institutionalism (Jepperson 1991; Meyer 2008). I argue that my ideal type theory entails definite family resemblances with phenomenological institutionalism as it has

evolved ever since Meyer and Rowan's (1977) account that foregrounds rational myths which bear a legitimating outward appearance of unyielding rationality even where critical scrutiny will not substantiate the rationality claims. Legitimation takes place by means of ritual and ceremony, and facilitated by loose coupling of the 'pomp and circumstance' of the legitimating practices with the sensitive institutional core, the latter receives protection from the former.

I see Meyer and Rowan's emphases to grow out of the same stock as Weber's (1985c, 16) suggestion that '(e)ine *nur* aus zweckrationalen Motiven ingehaltene Ordnung ist im allgemeinen... [labil]' —, 'an order maintained *only* out of formally rational motives is generally... [unstable]' (my translation). Therefore I finish by re-emphasizing the charismatic possibilities of re-enchantment, as illustrated in my ideal type theory with the tendencies of the Eastern Orthodox Church and its monasticism to shed more than occasionally the disenchanting Weberian 'iron cage' of comprehensively rationalized organization and management as conveyed by the winning Western cultural model.

Endnote

1 In revising my text I have greatly benefited of suggestions made by Professor Michael Rowlinson, editor to Management & Organizational History (MOH); an anonymous reviewer of MOH; Academy Finland Professor Kari Palonen as a scholar of Max Weber; Elina Kahla, D.Soc.Sc., as a scholar of present-day Russian Orthodox sainthood; Emilia Palonen, PhD in ideological discourse analysis of the University of Essex; and Mark Shackleton, PhD, whose linguistic expertise was made available by the Language Services of the University of Helsinki.

References

- Adair-Toteff, C. 2002. Max Weber's mysticism. *European Journal of Sociology* 43: 339–353.
- Alfeyev, I. 2009. *Vo tchto veryat pravoslavnye khristianye?* Moskva: Eksmo.
- Amand, D.-D. 1948. *L'ascèse monastique de Saint Basile*. Maredsous: Éditions Maredsous.
- Athanasios. 1989. *The life of St. Anthony the Great*. Willits, CA: Eastern Orthodox Books.
- Baehr, P. 2001. The 'iron cage' and the 'shell as hard a steel': Parsons, Weber, and the *stalhartes Gehäuse* metaphor in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*'. *History and Theory* 40: 153–169.
- Barry, D. and H. Hanson, eds. 2008. *New approaches in management and organization*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Benz, E. 1963. *Eastern Church: Its thought and life*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Billington, J.H. 1970. *The icon and the axe: An interpretive history of Russian culture*. New York: Vintage.
- Booth, C. and M. Rowlinson. 2005. Management and organizational history: prospects. *Management and Organizational History* 1: 5–30.
- Booth, C., M. Rowlinson, P. Clark, A. Delahaye, and S. Procter. 2009. Scenarios and counterfactuals as modal narratives. *Futures* 41: 87–95.
- Buss, Andreas. 2003. *The Russian-Orthodox tradition and modernity*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bychkov, V.V. and O.V Bychkov. 1998. Russian religious aesthetics. In: *Encyclopaedia of aesthetics*, ed. M. Kelly, 195–202. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chalcraft, D. 1994. Bringing the text back in: On ways of reading the iron cage metaphor in the two editions of the *Protestant Ethic*. In: *Organizing modernity: New Weberian perspectives on work, organization and society*, ed. L.J. Ray, and M. Reed, 16–45. London: Routledge.

- Clegg, S.R., C. Hardy, T.B. Lawrence and W.R. Nord, eds. 2006. *The Sage handbook of organization studies*. 2. ed. London: Sage.
- Conger, J.A. 1993. Max Weber's conceptualization of charismatic authority: Its influence on organizational research. *Leadership Quarterly* 4, 277-288.
- Coniaris, A.M. 1985. *Sacred symbols that speak. I*. Minneapolis: Light and Life.
- Coniaris, A.M. 1987. *Sacred symbols that speak. II*. Minneapolis: Light and Life.
- DiMaggio, P. J. and W.W. Powell, W.W. 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review* 48: 147–160.
- Eliade, M. 1959. *The sacred and the profane*. London: Harcourt.
- Evdokimov, P. 1998. *Ages of the spiritual life*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Theological Seminary Press.
- Fedotov, G.P. 1966. *The Russian religious mind. II*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Foucault, M. 1988. Technologies of the self. In: *Technologies of the self*, ed. L.H. Martin, H. Gutman and P.H. Hutton, 16–49. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Gagliardi, P. 2006. Exploring the aesthetic side of organizational life. In: *Handbook of organization studies*, ed. S.R. Clegg, C. Hardy, and W.R. Nord, 701–724. 2. ed. London: Sage.
- Geertz, C. 1973. *The interpretation of cultures*. London: Fontana.
- Gothóni, R. 1993. *Paradise within reach: Monasticism and pilgrimage on Mt. Athos*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Greenwood, R., C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, and K. Sahlin-Anderson, eds. 2008. *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*. London: Sage.
- Hadot, P. 1995. *Philosophy as a way of life*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Heyd, D. 2006. Supererogation. *Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Available at <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/supererogation/>.

- Inauen, E., K. Rost, B.S. Frey, F. Homberg, & M. Osterloh. 2010. Monastic governance: Forgotten prospects for public institutions. *The American Review of Public Administration* 40, online preprint for subscribers.
- Ivánka, E. v. 1990. *Plato christianus*. Paris: PUF.
- Jepperson, R. 1991. Institutions, institutional effects, and institutionalism. In: *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis*, ed. W.W. Powell and P.J. Maggio, 143–163. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kieser, A. 1987. From asceticism to administration of wealth: Medieval monasteries and the pitfalls of rationalization. *Organization Studies* 8: 102–123.
- Kieser, A. 1994. Why organization theory needs historical analyses. *Organization Science* 5: 608–620.
- Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. 1999. *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lee, R.L.M. 2010. Weber, re-enchantment and social futures. *Time & Society* 19: 180–192.
- Likachev, D.K. 1999. Religion: Russian Orthodoxy. In: *The Cambridge companion to modern Russian culture*, ed. N. Rzhevsky, 38–56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liveris, L.B. 2005. *Ancient taboos and gender prejudice: Challenges for Orthodox women and the Church*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Lossky, V. 1973. *The mystical theology of the Eastern Church*. Cambridge: James Clarke.
- Madeley, J. 2009. Unequally yoked: The antinomies of church-state separation in Europe and the USA. *European Political Science* 8: 273–288.
- Manoussakis, J. 2007. *God after metaphysics: A theological aesthetic*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Masaryk, T.G. 1913. *Zur russischen Geschichts- und Religionsphilosophie*. Jena: Eugen Diederichs.

- McGrath, P. 2002. Early medieval Irish monastic communities: A premodern model with post-modern resonances. *Culture and Organization* 8: 195–208.
- McGrath, P. 2005. Thinking differently about knowledge-intensive firms: Insights from early medieval Irish monasticism. *Organization* 12: 549–566.
- McGuckin, J. 2008. *The Orthodox Church*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Meyendorff, J. 1959. *Introduction à l'étude de Grégoire Palamas*. Paris: Seuil.
- Meyendorff, J. 1983. *Byzantine theology*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Meyer, J.W. 2008. Reflections on the institutional theories of organization. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, and K. Sahlin-Anderson, eds. 2008. *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism*, 788-809. London: Sage.
- Meyer, J.W. and B. Rowan, B. 1977. Institutional organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology* 83: 340–363.
- Meyer, J.W. and R.L. Jepperson. 2000. 'The 'actors' of modern society: The cultural construction of social agency. *Sociological Theory* 18: 100–120.
- Meyer, R.E. and E. Boxenbaum. 2010. Exploring European-ness in organization research. *Organization Studies* 31: 737–755.
- Mitzman, A. 1969. *The iron cage: An historical interpretation of Max Weber*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Newman, M.G. 2009. Considerations of life and death: Medieval asceticism and the dissolution of the self. *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 21: 177–196.
- Paganopoulos, Michelangelo. 2009. The concept of 'Athonian economy' in the monastery of Vatopaidi. *Journal of Cultural Economy* 2: 363-378.
- Palmer, G.E.H., P. Sherrard and K. Ware, transl. 1979-2007. *The Philokalia*. 5 vols. London: Faber and Faber.

- Palonen, K. 1998. Das 'Webersche Moment': Zur kontingenz des Politischen. Opladen: Westdeutsche Verlag.
- Palonen, K. 2010. 'Objektivität' als faires Spiel: Wissenschaft als Politik bei Max Weber. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Parker, M. 2009. Angelic organization: Hierarchy and the tyranny of heaven. *Organization Studies* 30: 1281–1299.
- Plato. 2007. Republic. London: Penguin.
- Pushkin, A. 1984. Otchy pustynniki i zheny neporochny, originally 1836. In: *Sotchinenya v tryoh tomah*, 1, by A. Pushkin, 584–585. Moscow: Hudozhestvennaya Literatura.
- Rancour-Laferrière, D. 1995. The slave soul of Russia. New York: New York University Press.
- Reed, M.I. 2005. The agency/structure dilemma in organization theory. In: *The Oxford handbook of organization theory*, ed. H. Tsoukas and C. Knudsen, 289–309. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ringer, F. 2000. Max Weber's methodology. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ringer, F. 2002. Max Weber on causal analysis, interpretation, and comparison. *History and Theory* 41: 163–178.
- Robertson, R. 1975. On the analysis of mysticism: Pre-Weberian, Weberian and post-Weberian perspectives. *Sociological Analysis* 36: 241–266.
- Robertson, R. 1985. Max Weber and German sociology of religion. In: *Nineteenth century religious thought in the West*, III, ed. N. Smart, J. Clayton, S. Katz, and P. Sherry, 263–304. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, N. 1990. Shaping the soul: The shaping of the private self. London: Routledge.

- Rosenthal, B.G. 1991. The search for an Orthodox work ethic. In: *Between tsar and people: educated society and the quest for public identity in late imperial Russia*, ed. E.W. Clowes, S.D. Kassow, and J.L. West, 57-74. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press.
- Rost, K., E. Inauen, M. Osterloh, and B.S. Frey. 2010. The corporate governance of Benedictine abbeys: What can stock corporations learn from monasteries? *Journal of Management History* 16: 90–115.
- Roudometof, V. 2008. Greek Orthodoxy, territoriality, and globality. *Sociology of Religion* 69: 67–91.
- Rowlinson, M. and S. Procter. 1999. Organization culture and business history. *Organization Studies* 20: 369–396.
- Runciman, S. 1968. *The Great Church in captivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silber, I. 1995. *Virtuosity, charisma, and social order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, D.N. 1998. Faith, reason and charisma: Rudolf Sohm, Max Weber, and the theology of grace. *Sociological Inquiry* 68: 32–60.
- Starbuck, W.H. 2005. The origins of organization theory. In: *The Oxford handbook of organization theory*, ed. H. Tsoukas and C. Knudsen, 143–182. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sulek, M. 2010. On the classical meaning of philanthropia. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 39: 385–408.
- Symonds, M. and J. Pudsey. 2006. The forms of brotherly love in Max Weber's sociology of religion. *Sociological Theory* 24: 133–149.
- Symonds, M. and J. Pudsey. 2007. Heroic love: The ethic of brotherliness in Max Weber's 'vocation' lectures. *Max Weber Studies* 7: 63–87.
- Tchypin, V. 2009. *Kanonicheskoye pravo*. Moskva: Izdatelstvo Sretenskogo Monastyrya.

- Thomas, J. and A.C. Hero, eds. 2000. Byzantine monastic foundation documents. Washington, D.C.: Trustees for Harvard University.
- Turner, C. 1999. Weber and Dostoyevsky on church, sect and democracy. In: Max Weber and the culture of anarchy, ed. S. Whimster, 162–175. Houndmills: Macmillan.
- Üsdiken, B. and A. Kieser. 2004. Introduction: History in organization studies. *Business History*, 46, 321–330.
- Van Maanen, J. 1988. *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wang, Y. 2008. Agency: the internal split of structure. *Sociological Forum* 23: 481–502.
- Ward, B., ed. 2004. *The desert fathers*. London: Penguin.
- Ware, K. 1997. My helper and my enemy: The body in Greek Christianity. In: *Religion and the body*, ed. S. Coakley, 90–110. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weber, M. 1984 (ongoing publication project). *Max Weber-Gesamtausgabe*. Planned to comprise 42 volumes. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Weber, M. 1985a. Die 'Objektivität' sozialwissenschaftlicher und sozialpolitischer Erkenntnis. In: *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*, 146–214. Tübingen: Mohr. Translation Weber, M. 1949a. Objectivity in social science and social policy. In: *The methodology of the social sciences*, ed. and translated by E.A. Shils & H.A. Finch, 49–112. New York: Free Press.
- Weber, M. 1985b. Kritische Studien auf dem Gebiet der kulturwissenschaftlichen Logik. In: *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*, 215–290. Tübingen: Mohr. Translation Weber, M. 1949b. Critical studies in the logic of the cultural sciences. In: *The methodology of the social sciences*, ed. and translated by E.A. Shils & H.A. Finch, 113–188. New York: Free Press.

- Weber, M. 1985c. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*. 5. ed. Tübingen: Mohr. Translation Weber, M. 1978. *Economy and society*. Vol. 1., Vol. 2. Translated by G. Roth and C. Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Weber, M. 1985d. Wissenschaft als Beruf. In: *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*, 582–613. Tübingen: Mohr. Translation Weber, M. 1958a. Science as a vocation. In: *From Max Weber*, 129–156. Translated by H.H. Gerth and C.W. Mills. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Weber, M. 1985e. Über einige Kategorien der verstehenden Soziologie. In: *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre*, 424–474. Tübingen: Mohr. Translation Weber, M. 1981. Some categories of interpretive sociology. Translated by E.E. Graeber. *The Sociological Quarterly* 22, 151–180.
- Weber, M. 1988a. Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus. In: *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, I, 17–206. Tübingen: Mohr. Translation Weber, M. 1985f. The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism. Translated by T. Parsons. London: Unwin.
- Weber, M. 1988b. Die Wirtschaftsethik der Weltreligionen. In: *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, I, 237–573. Tübingen: Mohr. Partial translation Weber M. 1958c. Religious rejections of the world and their directions. In: *From Max Weber*, 323–362. Translated by H.H. Gerth and C.W. Mills. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Weber, M. 1988c. Politik als Beruf. In: *Gesammelte Politische Schriften*, 502–560. Tübingen: Mohr. Translation Weber, M. 1948b. Politics as a vocation. In: *From Max Weber*, 77–128. Translated by H.H. Gerth and C.W. Mills. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Weber, M. 1988d. Parlament und Regierung in neugeordneten Deutschland. In: *Gesammelte Politische Schriften*, 306–443. Tübingen: Mohr. Translation Weber, M. 1994. Parliament and government in Germany under a new political order. In: *Max Weber: Political writings*, ed. and translated by P. Lassman and R. Speirs, 130–271. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weber, M. 1988e. Erste Diskussionsrede zu E. Troeltschs Vortrag über 'Das stoisch-christliche Naturrecht'. In: *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Soziologie und Sozialpolitik*, 462–469. Tübingen: Mohr. According to knowledge available to me, the essay has not been translated into English so far.

Ybema, S., D. Yanow, H. Wels, and F. Kamsteeg, eds. 2009. *Organizational ethnography*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Zenkovsky, V.V. 2003. *A history of Russian philosophy*. Vol. 1. London: Routledge.

Pertti Ahonen [pertti.ahonen@helsinki.fi] is Professor of Political Science, with special reference to Administrative Research, at the University of Helsinki. His research interests include organization theory and research, political history of organizations, and institutionalist research.
